

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, claims 1 and 3 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims as requested is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Cannon et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0090912). In paragraph 5 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. in view of Liang and further in view of Mooney et al. (US Publication No. 2003/0045235). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In paragraph 6 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. in view of Liang and further in view of Hahn et al. (WO 00/72555). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but have amended the application to provide additional clarity without changing the scope thereof.

We submit that the claims are not anticipated by Cannon et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0090912). According to Cannon et al, it is possible to store an identification key from a master station in a communications unit corresponding to the address fields 8, which are shown in Figure 1 according to the application.

There is however no disclosure within Cannon et al. that indicates that the communications unit (in addition to the well-known address fields 8) has a special address field 9 with an associated electrical lock, which is reserved so that only master stations having a special identification key are capable of addressing the address field 9.

In other words, the communications unit according to the invention has both the well-known address fields, which may optionally be overwritten, and a single address field with a special electrical lock, which provides the advantage that even if all the address fields 8 are “occupied”, then no one will be able to use the address field 9 without a special “permission”.

The advantage is that even though all of the address fields 8 (that can be overwritten) are occupied (is use), nobody – except a unit with a special permission (unique identification key) – will be able to use the address field 9.

Accordingly, only a master station having the unique identification key can write in address field 9. A completely new possibility of controlling the communications system has been claimed and provides advantages which were not perceived by Cannon. The addition of the Mooney et al reference does not provide the missing guidance.

Note that both units 2 and 3 can open the electrical lock and get access to address field 9, but only if they know the unique identification key.

Additionally, Liang relates to/mentions Bluetooth communication with a headset. However, the present application is directed to a communications system in a certain way that may include the use of Bluetooth or DECT standards, cf. the description.

Claim 3 provides further clarification of the locked and unlocked address field concept. The Cannon reference does not provide a useful teaching this regard.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. The amendments clarify the patentable

invention without adding new subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Michael B. Lasky at (612) 436-3152.

Respectfully submitted,
Altera Law Group, LLC
Customer No. 22865

Date: May 30, 2008

By: /Michael Lasky/
Michael B. Lasky
Reg. No. 29,555